

1                                   **MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE**  
2                                   **CODE SMTX THINK TANK**  
3                                   **December 16, 2015**  
4                                   **San Marcos Activity Center RM#3**  
5                                   **501 E Hopkins Street**  
6

7   **THINK TANK MEMBERS PRESENT:**           John David Carson  
8   Chris Wood  
9   Shawn Dupont  
10    Diann McCabe  
11    Betsy Robertson  
12    Tom Wassenich  
13    David Singleton  
14

15 **STAFF PRESENT:**                               Shannon Mattingly, Director of Planning  
16   and Development Services  
17   Abby Gillfillan, Permit Center Manager  
18   Greg Schwartz, Environmental Engineer  
19   John Gleason, San Marcos Watershed  
20   Initiative  
21   Ann Gabriel, Environmental Compliance  
22   Program Coordinator  
23   Andrew Rice, Permit Technician  
24   Diane Miller, Civic Collaboration  
25

26 **Call To Order**  
27

28 With a quorum present, the Think Tank Meeting was called to order by Chair John David Carson  
29 at 6:03 p.m. on Wednesday, December 16, 2015 at San Marcos Activity Center RM#3, 501 E  
30 Hopkins Street, San Marcos, Texas.  
31

32 **30-Minute Citizen Comment Period**  
33

34 Vincent Debrock provided comments and concerns pertaining to landscaping and tree  
35 preservation. Mr. Debrock commented that he was concerned with the provision that trees within  
36 the building footprint, 10 feet of the building footprint, driveways, sidewalks, and other areas  
37 necessary for site access are exempt from the preservation of trees, other than heritage trees. Mr.  
38 Debrock requested that the Think Tank look at these areas of the code. Mr. Debrock further  
39 commented that he would be available for questions pertaining to landscaping and trees.  
40

41 **Approval of Minutes from November 18 and December 2, 2015**  
42

43 During the December 2 meeting, Chair John David Carson provided a document of amendments  
44 to replace lines 17-25 of the November 18, 2015 minutes.  
45

1 Chris Wood requested an amendment to lines 7 and 8 of page 2 of the November 18, 2015  
2 minutes. Chris requested to delete the words ‘industrial development’ from the sentence.

3  
4 Tom Wassenich made a motion to approve the minutes from November 18 and December 2,  
5 2015 with the amendment proposed by Chris Wood and with the separate document provided by  
6 Chair Carson. The motion was seconded by Chris Wood. The motion carried.

### 7 8 **Review and Discuss Think Tank Response to December 2 Issue Exploration Items**

9  
10 Abby Gillfillan provided an overview of met and unmet interests identified at the December 2,  
11 2015 meeting.

12  
13 The Think requested the following additions to the *Environmental Standards – Intensity Zones*  
14 Issue Exploration topic that was discussed at the December 2, 2015 Meeting:

- 15  
16 1. The Think Tank requested to add ‘i.e. fee-in-lieu / drainage fee’ to the unmet interest of  
17 *lack of definition and plan for financing*.  
18 2. The Think Tank provided a new brainstormed solution to ‘capture the percentage of  
19 public infrastructure and use as a baseline for drainage costs that the public at large is  
20 responsible for’.

### 21 22 **Issue Exploration – Environmental Standards**

23  
24 Abby Gillfillan provided an overview of the proposed environmental standards including a  
25 summary of the 2014 Land Development Code revisions.

#### 26 27 **a. Increased standards over the Edwards Aquifer and in San Marcos River Corridor**

28  
29 Abby provided an overview of current and proposed Edwards Aquifer recharge  
30 requirements. The Think Tank commented that viewing a map of the river buffers would  
31 be beneficial to their ability to make comments on the Code SMTX proposed revisions.  
32 The Think tank would like to see a map of the stream buffers as proposed by the WQPP  
33 at the next meeting.

34  
35 The Think Tank identified the following met interest:

- 36  
37 1. The proposed Code SMTX standards create a topographically defined river  
38 corridor as opposed to a corridor defined by metes and bounds. Additionally,  
39 the corridor gives consideration to political boundaries.

40  
41 The Think Tank identified the following unmet interests:

- 42  
43 1. Consider applying higher standards to the Blanco River;  
44 2. Need a public notice and adoption process for annual modifications; and  
45 3. Need further details, maps, and more defined proposals for increased water  
46 quality and corridor standards.

1       **b. Cluster Development in Environmentally Sensitive Areas**

2  
3       The Think Tank identified the following met interest:

- 4  
5               1. Cluster Development reduces disturbed area.

6  
7       The Think Tank identified the following unmet interest:

- 8  
9               1. Consider allowing a service center within Cluster Developments

10  
11       The Think Tank provided the following Brainstormed Solutions:

- 12  
13               1. Run the numbers to ensure there is a density bonus with Cluster  
14               Developments; and  
15               2. If CD-5 zoning is proposed within a Cluster Development, the percentage of  
16               allowed CD-5 be limited to 5 percent of the total area.

17  
18       **c. Tree Preservation and Mitigation**

19  
20       The Think Tank identified the following met interest:

- 21  
22               1. The proposed Code SMTX revisions align San Marcos with other cities in the  
23               corridor.

24  
25       The Think Tank identified the following unmet interest:

- 26  
27               1. Concerns regarding the “developable window” on infill residential lots.

28  
29       The Think Tank provided the following Brainstormed Solutions:

- 30  
31               1. Suggest adding a requirement to plant a variety of tree sizes, instead of just  
32               requiring a minimum of 2” in caliper trees at time of planting;  
33               2. Provide an option for tree plantings to be placed in other areas of the lot;  
34               3. Consider having a grandfathered plat date; and  
35               4. Limit reclamation amount such as adding a cap on an existing infill lot or a  
36               cap on the number of required trees.

37  
38       **d. Landscaping Requirements**

39  
40       The Think Tank identified the following met interests. There were no identified unmet  
41       interests.

- 42  
43               1. Consider using Austin or San Antonio planting lists.

44  
45       The Think Tank provided the following Brainstormed Solutions:

46

1. Consider excluding invasive species or including a reference list, such as the Texas Invasive Species List, so that the community can be educated;
2. Include these proposed landscaping standards in conventional zoning districts; and
3. Consider consolidating the tree and landscaping standards into one area within the code.

## **Next Steps**

### **a. Future Agenda Items**

Abby commented that Lee Einsweiler from Code Studio will be speaking at the January 6, 2015 meeting. The January 20 meeting will be the last Think Tank meeting.

### **b. Outreach Efforts**

Abby gave a brief overview of the website updates and Virtual Open House.

### **c. Virtual Open House**

Abby encouraged the Think Tank to view the Virtual Open House and online survey.

## **Questions from the press and public**

There were no questions from the press or public.

## **Adjourn**

**THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS, THE MEETING ADJOURNED AT 8:16 P.M.**

\_\_\_\_\_  
John David Carson, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Betsy Robertson, Vice-Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Shawn DuPont

\_\_\_\_\_  
Diann McCabe

\_\_\_\_\_  
Tom Wassenich

\_\_\_\_\_  
David Singleton

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chris Wood

**ATTEST:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Andrea Villalobos, Planning Technician